

## **SUMMARY and FISCAL NOTE**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Dept. Contact:</b>	<b>CBO Contact:</b>
Economic Development	Casey Rogers	Nick Tucker

### **1. BILL SUMMARY**

**Legislation Title:** AN ORDINANCE relating to the University District Business Improvement Area; modifying the process for selecting a program manager; modifying the requirements governing the composition of the BIA Advisory Board; and amending Ordinance 126093.

**Summary and Background of the Legislation:**

Originally established in 1996 through Ordinance 118412, then updated and expanded in 2015 via Ordinance 124761, and renewed in 2020 via Ordinance 126093, the University District Business Improvement Area is proposing two administrative amendments to their current ordinance:

1. **Removal of the RFP requirement from the ordinance.** The existing University District BIA ordinance requires the Office of Economic Development to conduct an RFP process every five years to identify a program manager. This process has proven to be inefficient and unproductive. Unlike any of Seattle’s other 10 BIAs, this requirement imposes an undue administrative burden without delivering public benefit. In January 2025 OED ran the first RFP process per this requirement and confirmed that the process attracted unqualified applicants who were unfamiliar with the University District community, and took significant time and resources from City staff, community volunteers, and applicants. Eliminating this requirement would align the UDBIA with practices of other BIAs and allow more focus on service delivery and program impact.
2. **Adjust the mandatory board seats to be recommended board seats, to make Board administration easier.** Section 13 of Ordinance 126093 includes highly specific board seat requirements that have become increasingly difficult to fulfill. This rigidity has led to challenges in maintaining a full, effective board, due in part to the realities of volunteer engagement and turnover. By shifting from mandatory to recommended board roles, the UDBIA would retain the original intent of diverse representation while gaining flexibility to fill vacancies and maintain consistent governance.

Given the nature of the proposed changes, this legislation will not require a public hearing.

### **2. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

**Does this legislation create, fund, or amend a CIP Project?** ☐ Yes ☒ No

### **3. SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

**Does this legislation have financial impacts to the City?** ☐ Yes ☒ No

### 3.d. Other Impacts

**Does the legislation have other financial impacts to The City of Seattle, including direct or indirect, one-time or ongoing costs, that are not included in Sections 3.a through 3.c? If so, please describe these financial impacts.**

None.

**If the legislation has costs, but they can be absorbed within existing operations, please describe how those costs can be absorbed. The description should clearly describe if the absorbed costs are achievable because the department had excess resources within their existing budget or if by absorbing these costs the department is deprioritizing other work that would have used these resources.**

None.

**Please describe any financial costs or other impacts of *not* implementing the legislation.**

None. The University District BIA is established as a revenue-neutral program.

**Please describe how this legislation may affect any City departments other than the originating department.**

This legislation does not affect any City department other than the Office of Economic Development.

### 4. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

**a. Is a public hearing required for this legislation?**

No

**b. Is publication of notice with The Daily Journal of Commerce and/or The Seattle Times required for this legislation?**

No

**c. Does this legislation affect a piece of property?**

No.

**d. Please describe any perceived implication for the principles of the Race and Social Justice Initiative.**

- i. How does this legislation impact vulnerable or historically disadvantaged communities? How did you arrive at this conclusion? In your response please consider impacts within City government (employees, internal programs) as well as in the broader community.**

There are no perceived impacts to vulnerable or historically disadvantaged communities with this legislation.

- ii. Please attach any Racial Equity Toolkits or other racial equity analyses in the development and/or assessment of the legislation.**

We did not conduct a Racial Equity Toolkit as part of this legislation.

- iii. What is the Language Access Plan for any communications to the public?**

There was no public communication associated with this legislation.

**e. Climate Change Implications**

- i. Emissions: How is this legislation likely to increase or decrease carbon emissions in a material way? Please attach any studies or other materials that were used to inform this response.**

This legislation is not likely to impact carbon emissions in a material way.

- ii. Resiliency: Will the action(s) proposed by this legislation increase or decrease Seattle's resiliency (or ability to adapt) to climate change in a material way? If so, explain. If it is likely to decrease resiliency in a material way, describe what will or could be done to mitigate the effects.**

This legislation is not likely to impact Seattle's resiliency in a material way.

- f. If this legislation includes a new initiative or a major programmatic expansion: What are the specific long-term and measurable goal(s) of the program? How will this legislation help achieve the program's desired goal(s)? What mechanisms will be used to measure progress towards meeting those goals?**

The U District BIA is an existing program.

- g. Does this legislation create a non-utility CIP project that involves a shared financial commitment with a non-City partner agency or organization?**  
No.

<b>5. ATTACHMENTS</b>
-----------------------

**Summary Attachments:** None.